

REMARKS

Claims 5, 8-10 and 18-22 were pending in the application. Claims 5 and 18 have been amended.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103

I. The Office Action rejected claims 18-22 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (US 6,604,104) in view of Grovit (Pub. No. 2003/0074310). Independent claims 5 and 18 have been amended to eliminate language interpreted by the Examiner as being an intended use.

Smith relates to a technique for transferring data between data stores using messaging. However, Smith provides no teaching of security of data, encryption of data, internet, nor firewall support. Grovit relates to a specialized money transfer application, but it solves only the problem of money transfer. It does not teach or suggest any modification of the Smith system as argued by the Office Action.

The Office Action conceded that Smith doesn't use the claimed invention in a hub and spoke system but the claim language "acting as a spoke" is just an "intended use." This is a misinterpretation of the claim language which does not say anything about this being an intended use and is not in the preamble of the claim. The language "acting as" limits the scope of the claims and is not just indicating an intended use. Nevertheless, to clarify the interpretation, claims 18 and 5 have been amend to delete the "acting as" language. The Examiner is respectfully reminded that the statute (i.e., §103) requires considering the claims as a whole and express claim limitations should not be ignored.

Moreover, the Office Action notes that hub and spoke integration system architecture is well known in the art. Applicant acknowledges that as a general matter hub and spoke architecture is known but strongly maintains that it is still possible that new and non-obvious

inventions may still be made in that field.

Claims 10-22 are dependent on claim 18 and thus are patentable over the combination of Smith and Grovit for at least the foregoing reasons.

II. The Office Action rejected claims 5 and 8-10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feldbaum (6,446,206) in view of Perry et al. (US 2003/0220768) and Grovit.

Feldbaum describes a messaging system where the sender of the message is authenticated using certificates and the certificates are used to sign and verify the messages. Perry is directed to an integrated system ("eCentre") that allows collecting, propagating, distributing, storing and transforming data or information generated by the tools to different parties. This is a specialized data transfer system applicable to a manufacturing problem. It solves one problem: data transfer between a fabricator and an original equipment manufacturer. It neither teaches nor suggests modification of systems such as Perry's to do what Applicant claims.

Grovit discusses a specialized money transfer application and, as previously stated, solves only one problem, money transfer. Grovit does not teach or suggest modification of Feldbaum to do what Applicant claims.

By contrast with the teachings of the prior art, the claimed invention allows

- (1) data to be transmitted over the internet using HTTP;
- (2) data to be transmitted through firewalls;
- (3) providing security for the data using HTTPS and encryptions;
- (4) includes protocol to tell the other side to stop sending messages; and
- (5) messages to be typed high level business objects such as Customer and Orders.

The invention of claim 5 uses HTTPS and SSL for securing data and provides other advances services such as:

- (1) support for typed high level business objects;

- (2) sending messages over the internet and through firewalls;
- (3) Ability for each side to tell the other side to stop or pause sending message; and
- (4) the authentication is server authentication and not user authentication.

The claimed invention is a generic infrastructure that can be applied to a wide variety of problem domains which supports messages that are typed high level business objects. It can model not only money but other kinds of data such as customer information, manufacturing data, sales data, etc.

Perry is a specialized data transfer system applicable to manufacturing problems. It solves one problem - data transfer between a FAB and an OEM. It does not teach or suggest modifying the Feldbaum reference to accomplish what Applicant claims.

Claims 8-10 are dependent on claim 5. They are therefore patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons that their parent claim 5 is patentable.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Buchenhorner/

Michael J. Buchenhorner
Reg. No. 33,162

E-filed on Date: October 28, 2008

Michael Buchenhorner, P.A.
8540 S.W. 83 Street
Miami, Florida 33143
(305) 273-8007 (voice)
(305) 595-9579 (fax)